

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GALE A. NORTON, Secretary of  
the Interior, et al.,

Defendants.

---

)  
)  
) No. 1:96CV01285  
) (Judge Lamberth)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AN  
ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE COMMENTS TO DEFENDANTS' FIRST  
SUBMISSION IN COMPLIANCE WITH MAY 28, 2004 MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER REGARDING HISTORICAL STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNT**

In its Memorandum and Order dated May 28, 2004, the Court required Defendants, before sending any historical statements of account to Individual Indian Money ("IIM") account holders, to submit to the Court "(1) a sample of the actual letter to be mailed with the [prescribed] language inserted; (2) a sample of one of the historical statements of account; and (3) the exact number of historical statements of account and transmittal letters [Defendants] plan to send out." Memorandum and Order at 4. The Court required that "[a]ny sample documents should be redacted to remove all personally identifying information regarding the recipient." Id. at 4 n.2. On June 22, 2004, in compliance with the Court's Order, Defendants submitted, among other documents, a redacted sample transmittal letter and a redacted sample historical statement of account. See Defendants' First Submission In

Compliance With May 28, 2004 Memorandum And Order Regarding Historical Statements Of Account (filed June 22, 2004). The only information redacted from these documents is the name and address of the account holder, the account number, the account balance and transaction amounts,<sup>1</sup> and journal voucher numbers.

The Court's Order permitted Plaintiffs to "within 5 days of receipt of defendants' submission, submit to the Court brief comments or substitute language." Memorandum and Order at 4. Plaintiffs elected not to do so. Instead, on June 25, 2004, they moved for an enlargement of time of "five business days after receipt of the unredacted sample letter and historical statement to file their comments." Plaintiffs' Motion For An Enlargement Of Time To File Comments To Defendants' First Submission In Compliance With May 28, 2004 Memorandum And Order Regarding Historical Statements Of Account ("Motion for Enlargement") (filed June 25, 2004) at 1.

Plaintiffs make no effort whatsoever to explain why they need unredacted copies of the sample historical statement of account and transmittal letter in order to provide "brief comments or substitute language" regarding these sample documents; indeed, it is difficult to fathom how the identity of the account holder (whose account, incidentally, was opened after the class was certified, and who does not appear to have any account created before class certification, and therefore does not fall within the class definition) or the amounts credited to

---

<sup>1/</sup> The account balance and transaction amounts were redacted because these numbers are ordinarily identical for all recipients of a particular tribal judgment or per capita payment.

the account holder's IIM account, could conceivably be relevant to the acceptability of the language related to the account holder's rights in this litigation.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Plaintiffs offer nothing more than the conclusory statements that they "cannot provide fully informed comments," Motion for Enlargement at 1, and that they are "unable to comment with specificity on the proposed transmission," *id.* at 4. Such statements do not suffice to justify an enlargement of the five-day period within which Plaintiffs were required to submit comments.<sup>3</sup>

As Plaintiffs have failed to offer any justification for an enlargement of time to file comments, the Court should deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Enlargement. As the deadline for filing such comments has passed, the Court should proceed to "conduct [its] final review of

---

<sup>2</sup> Even if Plaintiffs could devise an argument for requiring such information, similar information is readily available to them in the unredacted copies of the historical statements of account and transmittal letters provided to them on November 6, 2002, as government counsel advised Plaintiffs in the June 24, 2004 letter appended to Plaintiffs' Motion For Enlargement.

<sup>3</sup> Moreover, Plaintiffs' Motion For Enlargement contains several misrepresentations. Defendants never "claimed that plaintiffs' counsel were no longer entitled to review their own clients' confidential information," or "concealed this information from plaintiffs' counsel" or "refuse[d] to provide . . . historical statements of account to plaintiffs['] counsel," as Plaintiffs now assert. Motion For Enlargement at 2-3. To the contrary, the Court's November 1, 2002 Order permitting Defendants "pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)(11), to provide plaintiffs' counsel with a copy of any historical statements of account provided to any Individual Indian Money account holder," Order at 1 (Nov. 1, 2002), resulted from *Interior Defendants'* motion seeking an order permitting them to provide copies of the historical statements of account to Plaintiffs' counsel. See *Interior Defendants' Motion And Supporting Memorandum For Order Permitting The Provision Of Copies Of Historical Statements Of Account To Class Counsel* (filed Sept. 10, 2004). Plaintiffs opposed that motion.

[Defendants' submission]," as contemplated in its May 28, 2004 Memorandum and Order.

Memorandum and Order at 4.

Dated: July 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT D. McCALLUM, JR.  
Associate Attorney General  
PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General  
STUART E. SCHIFFER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN  
Director

/s/ Cynthia L. Alexander  
SANDRA P. SPOONER  
D.C. Bar No. 261495  
Deputy Director  
JOHN T. STEMPLEWICZ  
Senior Trial Counsel  
CYNTHIA L. ALEXANDER  
Trial Attorney  
Commercial Litigation Branch  
Civil Division  
P.O. Box 875  
Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, D.C. 20044-0875  
(202) 514-7194

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on July 9, 2004 the foregoing *Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for an Enlargement of Time to File Comments to Defendants' First Submission in Compliance with May 28, 2004 Memorandum and Order Regarding Historical Statements of Account* was served by Electronic Case Filing, and on the following who is not registered for Electronic Case Filing, by facsimile:

Earl Old Person (*Pro se*)  
Blackfeet Tribe  
P.O. Box 850  
Browning, MT 59417  
Fax (406) 338-7530

/s/ Kevin P. Kingston  
Kevin P. Kingston

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al., )  
 )  
Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
GALE A. NORTON, Secretary of the Interior, et al., )  
 )  
Defendants. )  

---

Case No. 1:96CV01285  
(Judge Lamberth)

**ORDER**

Upon consideration of *Plaintiffs' Motion For An Enlargement Of Time To File Comments To Defendants' First Submission In Compliance With May 28, 2004 Memorandum And Order Regarding Historical Statements Of Account*, Dkt. 2602, Defendants' opposition thereto, and the record in this case, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003.

---

ROYCE C. LAMBERTH  
United States District Judge

cc:

Sandra P. Spooner  
John T. Stemplewicz  
Commercial Litigation Branch  
Civil Division  
P.O. Box 875  
Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, D.C. 20044-0875  
Fax (202) 514-9163

Dennis M Gingold, Esq.  
Mark Brown, Esq.  
607 - 14th Street, NW, Box 6  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Fax (202) 318-2372

Keith Harper, Esq.  
Native American Rights Fund  
1712 N Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2976  
Fax (202) 822-0068

Elliott Levitas, Esq.  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530

Earl Old Person (*Pro se*)  
Blackfeet Tribe  
P.O. Box 850  
Browning, MT 59417  
(406) 338-7530